

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,673	02/14/2000	Meenarachagan Vishnu	FORE-54 7017	
75	90 04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
Ansel M Schwartz			TRAN, THIEN D	
One Sterling Plaza 201 N Craig Street Suite 304			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Pittsburgh, PA 15213			2616	
			DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/503,673	VISHNU, MEENARACHAGAN		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
	•	Thien D. Tran	2665		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app				
Period fo	or Reply				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS OF THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2006. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 					
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 18-38 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,3,16,18,26-28 and 33-38 is/are rejected Claim(s) 4-15,19-25, abd 29-32 is/are objected Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the company of the correction of the control of the co	on from consideration. Integration to the selection requirement. Integrate the service of the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) · No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa			

Art Unit: 2665

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
 Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 16, 37, 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being participated by Ganmukhi et al (U.S Patent No. 5,850,399 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 16, Ganmukhi discloses schedulers a data scheduling for service according to QoS (server) comprising:

a first level schedule (*first level generator*), hereinafter first level generator, associated with groups of connections G1 = 42, 52, 62, G2 = 72, G3 = 32, figure 1; and

a second and third level schedules (*second level generator*), hereinafter second level generator, associated corresponding to the groups of connections G1 = 42, 52, 62, G2 = 72, G3 = 32, said first level generator identifying which connections to be outputted to the second level generation for services in the next scheduling (*in the second level generator corresponds to a group in the first level generator that are to be considered for service*), col.3 lines 5-20, said second level generator identifies the connections corresponding to the group 20, 22, 17, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72, to receive service from the server according to the

Art Unit: 2665

priority, said second level generator in connection with said first level generator, col.3 lines 1-15.

Regarding claims 37, 38 Ganmukhi discloses an apparatus for serving connections comprising:

a server QoS, col.3 line 6;

a queue (*memory*), hereinafter memory, in which data of the connections is stored, said memory connected to the server, col.3 line 40; and

a hierarchical scheduler which schedules when the data of the connections in the memory is to receive service from the server, said scheduler connected to said server and said memory, figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 3, 18, 26, 27, 28, 33, 34, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganmukhi et al (U.S Patent No. 5,850,399 B1) in the view of Lahat et al (U.S Patent No. 6,417,944).

Regarding claims 3, 18, 26, Ganmukhi discloses an apparatus for serving connections comprising:

a server QoS, col.3 line 6;

Art Unit: 2665

a queue (memory), hereinafter memory, in which data of the connections is stored, said memory connected to the server, col.3 line 40; and

a hierarchical scheduler which schedules when the data of the connections in the memory is to receive service from the server, said scheduler connected to said server and said memory, figure 1.

Regarding claims 27, 33, Ganmukhi discloses an apparatus for serving connections comprising:

a data scheduling for service according to QoS (server), col.3 line 6;

a queue (memory), hereinafter memory, in which data of the connections is stored, said memory connected to the server, col.3 line 40; and

a scheduler which schedules when the cells of the connections in the memory are to receive service from the server based on intercell interval, wherein an intercell interval is how long the server take to service a cell, the scheduler connected to the server and memory, col.3 lines 60-65.

Regarding claim 28, Ganmukhi discloses the latency of cells/second (intercell intervals) is inversed proportional to number of bits/second (bandwidth), col.4 lines 1-10.

Ganmukhi does not disclose a filter mechanism, which filters out (idle connections) inactive groups of connections associated with schedules in the hierarchical schedule. Lahat discloses a filter for filtering and allowing certain wavelengths for outputting, col.8 lines 40-55. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have a schedule used the filter to

Art Unit: 2665

filter inactive connections so that memories in the schedule can be utilized more efficient as recited in claims 3, 18.

Regarding claims 34, 35, Ganmukhi does not disclose that bitmap generator for generating schedule bitmap indicating the group to be scheduled for service, which would have been well known method for generating data bits in communication encoder. Lahat, for example, discloses a generator for generating bitmap so that data can be composed by number of bits in a proper form for communication. See col.10 lines 1-20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to implement the feature of generating bitmap so that data can be composed by number of bits in a proper form for communication.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 4-15, 19-25, 29-32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claim 36 are allowed, because the prior arts fail to teach or fairly suggest an apparatus for serving connection comprising: a scheduler having a schedule bitmap and active bitmaps which indicate which connection are active, the scheduler filters out inactive connections from the schedule bitmap and ANDing schedule bitmap with the active bitmaps, the scheduler schedules when cells of

Art Unit: 2665

the connection in the memory are to receive service from the server, the scheduler connected to a server.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 03/04/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Ganmukhi does not teach the scheduler for identifying a fist group of connections and determining which connections of the group in the first level generator are to be considered for service by the second level generator. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Ganmukhi teaches the first level generator identifying which connections to be outputted to the second level generator for services in the next scheduling (*in the second level generator corresponds to a group in the first level generator that are to be considered for service*), col.3 lines 50-20, said second level generator identifies the connections corresponding to the groups 20, 22, 17, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72, to receive service from the server according to the priority, figure 1, col.3 lines 5-20.

Regarding claim 37, Applicant argues that Ganmukhi does not disclose a scheduler having schedule bitmaps, which can contain multiple bits per connection to schedule different type of bandwidth. In response to the argument, even though, Ganmukhi does not disclose scheduler having schedule bitmaps, which can contain multiple bits per connection to schedule different type of bandwidth, which is a well known method for generating data bits in

Art Unit: 2665

communication encoder. Lahat, for example, discloses a generator for generating bitmap so that data can be composed by number of bits in a proper form for communication. See col.10 lines 1-20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to implement the feature of scheduler having schedule bitmaps, which can contain multiple bits per connection to schedule different type of bandwidth so that data can be composed by number of bits in a proper form for communication.

Regarding claim 38, Applicant argues that Ganmukhi does not disclose a scheduler can enforce rate limiting in each level of the hierarchy. However, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Ganmukhi discloses that the scheduler controls the rate of each one of the six QoS traffic classes, col.4 lines 10-25 (controls rate limit).

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 2665

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from

the examiner should be directed to Thien Tran whose telephone number is (571)

272-3156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from

8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Doris To, can be reached on (571) 272-7629. Any inquiry

of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)

272-2600.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

Patent Examiner

Thien Tran

DORIS H. TO

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 8

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600